



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.       | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------------|------------------|
| 10/692,111      | 10/23/2003  | Sujal S. Parikh      | 14917.0236US01/MS305924.0 | 6567             |

27488 7590 05/31/2006

MERCHANT & GOULD (MICROSOFT)  
P.O. BOX 2903  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

|          |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

RIES, LAURIE ANNE

|          |              |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2176

DATE MAILED: 05/31/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|                              |                 |               |  |
|------------------------------|-----------------|---------------|--|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | Application No. | Applicant(s)  |  |
|                              | 10/692,111      | PARIKH ET AL. |  |
|                              | Examiner        | Art Unit      |  |
|                              | Laurie Ries     | 2176          |  |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 March 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 and 17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 14-16, 18 and 19 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 and 17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 October 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/1/03</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to communications: Response to Election/Restriction, filed 13 March 2006, to the original application filed 23 October 2003.
2. Claims 1-13 and 17 are pending. Claims 14-16 and 18-19 have been withdrawn. Claims 1, 7, 12, and 17 are independent claims.

### ***Election/Restrictions***

3. Applicant's election without traverse of species I, claims 1-13 and 17, in the reply filed on 13 March 2006 is acknowledged.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-8, 12-13, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holt (U.S. Patent 5,495,561).

**As per independent claims 1, 7, and 12**, Holt discloses a system for hosting a paginating control and for controlling pagination of a presentable object in a computer application, including representing pages on which the presentable object is paginated (See Holt, Figure 23, and Column 25, lines 36-49).

Holt also discloses methods of paginating an object (See Holt, Column 12, lines 56-67).

Holt also discloses methods of interacting with the paginating control (See Holt, Column 38, Claim 37).

While Holt does not disclose expressly a set of user-definable classes and methods to interact with the classes, Holt does disclose the use of object-oriented programming techniques, such as defining objects by creating classes and defining functions to manipulate the data (See Holt, Column 6, lines 53-55, and Column 7, lines 2-15). It was well known in the art at the time of the invention to include sets of user-definable classes and user-definable methods to operate on the user-definable classes in order to incorporate the techniques of Object-Oriented Programming (OOP). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the above mentioned OOP techniques to define specific functionality as disclosed by Holt. The motivation for doing so would have been to incorporate the inherent benefits of OOP, such as hiding a portion of the internal data structure and functions (i.e. encapsulation), allowing objects and functions that have the same format but that work with different data to function differently in order to produce consistent results (i.e. polymorphism), and to allow program developers to easily reuse pre-existing programs

and to avoid creating software from scratch (i.e. inheritance) (See Holt, Column 6, lines 65-67, and Column 7, lines 1-54).

**As per dependent claims 2, 8, and 13**, Holt discloses the limitation of claims 1, 7, and 12 as described above. Holt also discloses representing display information of a page (See Holt, Column 25, lines 36-52), representing descriptive information of a page (See Holt, Column 12, lines 15-20), representing page break information (See Holt, Column 12, lines 22-26), and representing positional information of content (See Holt, Column 12, lines 42-55).

**As per dependent claim 3**, Holt discloses the limitation of claim 1 as described above. Holt also discloses a method for measuring the object for pagination and a method for arranging paginated pages of the object for display (See Holt, Column 18, lines 65-67, and Column 19, lines 1-8).

**As per dependent claim 4**, Holt discloses the limitation of claim 3 as described above. Holt also discloses a method for updating the pagination of an object (See Holt, Column 18, lines 56-64).

**As per dependent claim 5**, Holt discloses the limitation of claim 3 as described above. Holt also discloses a method for calculating page break positions for an object to be paginated (See Holt, Column 16, lines 45-61).

**As per dependent claim 6**, Holt discloses the limitation of claim 3 as described above. Holt also discloses a method for setting a host of the object (See Holt, Columns 35-36, Claim 12).

**As per independent claim 17**, Holt discloses a method for calculating page break information for a page in a computer system including receiving size information (See Holt, Column 17, lines 41-55)

Holt also discloses receiving page descriptor information (See Holt, Column 12, lines 15-20).

Holt also discloses causing a page break calculating function to provide page break information using the size information and page descriptor information (See Holt, Column 16, lines 46-67, and Column 17, lines 1-55).

While Holt does not disclose expressly that the information is received as a parameter, it was well known in the art to use parameters to pass information. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to pass size information into a method or function as a parameter. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide for modularity of function, thus reducing the size of the various methods, and also to allow for the passing of variable data.

5. Claims 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holt (U.S. Patent 5,495,561) as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of Chiba (U.S. Publication 2005/0162694 A1).

**As per dependent claim 9**, Holt discloses the limitations of claim 7 as described above. Holt does not disclose expressly receiving notification that content in an object has changed. Chiba discloses providing notification regarding the status of print data

(See Chiba, Page 5, paragraph 0110). Holt and Chiba are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of controlling printed information. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide notification of a change of Chiba with the change in content in an object of Holt. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user to determine the significance of the changed data as it applies to the application. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Chiba with Holt for the benefit of allowing a user to determine the significance of the changed data as it applies to the application to obtain the invention as specified in claim 9.

**As per dependent claim 10**, Holt and Chiba disclose the limitations of claim 9 as described above. Holt also discloses including a start position and an end position between which content in the object has changed (See Holt, Column 14, lines 17-61, Column 15, lines 51-67, and Column 16, lines 1-11).

**As per dependent claim 11**, Holt and Chiba disclose the limitations of claim 9 as described above. Chiba also discloses providing notification regarding the status of print data (See Chiba, Page 5, paragraph 0110). Holt and Chiba are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of controlling printed information. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide notification of a change of Chiba with the different page size of Holt. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user to change the paper size in a printer output device in order to accommodate the data. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Chiba with Holt and Chiba for the benefit of allowing a user to

change the paper size in a printer output device in order to accommodate the data to obtain the invention as specified in claim 11.

### ***Conclusion***

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Smith (U.S. Patent 6,175,845 B1) discloses a method and component for the presentation of information.
- Roth (U.S. Patent 6,738,152 B1) discloses event-based printing.
- Joseph (U.S. Patent 5,873,106) discloses geometry management for displaying objects on a computer.
- Probets discloses the use of vector graphics, from PostScript and Flash to SVG.
- Furuta discloses a survey of document formatting systems.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laurie Ries whose telephone number is (571) 272-4095. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached on (571) 272-4136.



8. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LR

*William L. Bashore*  
**WILLIAM BASHORE**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**